OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Archives of Neuroscience
Article DOI: 10.5812/ans.104433
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 8(2); e104433

Peer Review Report for "Cross-Talk of Atherosclerosis and Ischemic Stroke: Dramatic Role of Neutrophils"

Author(s): Abdolreza Esmaeilzadeh, Maryam Zarerafie, Azita Mohammadzadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 May 2020
Revised Date: 2 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 3 May 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Seyed Amir Hossein Javadi: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 21 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
The authors presented a review (probably narrative!) to discuss the role of neutrophils and their cross-talk in atherosclerosis and ischemic stroke. However, the methodology is not described.
- The abstract should be structured, the methodology, type of study (narrative, systematic, etc.), and the method of search should be clarified.
- Some references are old and should be replaced with newer references.
- Keywords should be selected more relative.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 29 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
A major revision is needed.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | Revision (0) — 29 Nov 2020

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Journal of Archives of Neuroscience
Manuscript ID: 104433
Manuscript Title: **Cross-Talk of Atherosclerosis in Ischemic Stroke: Dramatic Role of Neutrophils**

Dear editor of Journal of Archives of Neuroscience

Thank you and your team

We have revised and resubmit our manuscript following the Journal of Archives of Neuroscience reviewers' comments and highlight them with the blue color following the text below.

Q: Your manuscript did not follow the journal's standards, please make it as standard according to the journal terms and bellow Instructions.

R:

Abstract:

1. In line 2, the word context is added.
2. Line 6-7-8 has been added.
3. In line 10, the word results are added.
4. In line 19, the word conclusion is added.

Main text:

1. Line 16-17-18 has been added to the text.
2. Line 19-20-21-22, Evidence Acquisition added.
3. The word RESULTS is added on line 23.
4. We have highlighted all the requested changes with the blue color.
5. In lines 24, 36, 76, 79, 117, 167, 174, 187, 189 and 210, the fonts have changed.
6. The discussion section has also been removed from lines 222 to 242 due to not being defined in the article.

- Figures

Q: Figure(s) is(are) not mentioned in the text correctly. Please, mention all Figure in the text consecutively.

R: Figures are mentioned in the text. In lines 35, 50, and 75, the word figure is added.

Q: Figures should be uploaded as separate files in the journal website.

R: Figures have been uploaded as separate files in the journal website.

It is our pleasure to find your useful comments to complete the manuscript.

Best regards,

Abdolreza Esmaeilzadeh

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 24 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
The recommended revisions are applied.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 3 May 2021

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 3 May 2021

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.